

New Boundary Bound States in an Open Quantum Spin Chain

Zhan-Ning Hu

Institute of Physics and Center for Condensed Matter Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China

Abstract

New boundary bound states (BBS) are found of an integrable model with the magnetic impurities located at the edges of an open Heisenberg spin chain. These bound states carry the real energy and are formed by three or five imaginary modes of the rapidities. These imaginary modes of the rapidities give the non-zero antisymmetric wave functions and the moments of the centers of the bound states are zero. It means that these bound states are arisen by the magnetic impurities and localized at the edges of the correlated system. The Kondo screening occurs for the antiferromagnetic spin chain with the ferromagnetic impurities-electrons exchange interaction.

Magnetic impurities in one-dimensional (1D) strongly correlated electron systems or quantum spin chains have been the focus of intense investigation. These strong correlated systems can be described in term of Luttinger liquid [1] and the behavior of the impurities in the 1D quantum systems is rather different from that in a Fermi liquid [2,3]. The availability of nonperturbative techniques allows us to have detailed pictures understanding the relevant physics and revealing some very interesting phenomena such as Kondo problem [4,2] and pinning of bound states in the low dimensional strong correlated electron systems and quantum spin chains. Experimentally, the magnetic impurities implant in carbon nanotubes or quantum wires and analogical phenomena, for example, the x -ray boundary effects, metal point-contact spectroscopies, etc, renew also the investigations of these problem.

The quantum inverse scattering method (QISM) and the Bethe ansatz (BA) techniques have provided us the very effective tools to study the magnetic impurities in the 1D quantum system. These methods have been used successfully to deal with the Kondo impurity in a free electron host, the magnetic impurities in spin chains and the mixed valent behavior of hybridization (Anderson-like, with hybridized impurity and host wave functions) [5–7]. Recently, in correlated electron hosts, the properties of the magnetic impurities have been studied in a series of very interesting papers [8,9]. The *periodic* boundary conditions were imposed on the electron host and spin chains for all these cases. Kane and Fisher investigated a 1D repulsive interacting system in the presence of a potential barrier and pointed out that it corresponds to a chain disconnected at the barrier site at low energy scales [10]. This can be effectively described by the *open* boundary conditions which are well studied by the boundary conformal field theory [11] and the BA methods [12,13]. Zvyagin get that the low-energy magnetic behaviors of an impurity in a chain with periodic boundary conditions and with open boundary conditions coincide up to mesoscopic corrections of order of L^{-1} with L being the length of the system [9]. Now we know that several methods have been used for introducing the impurities into the integrable models of correlated electrons and quantum spin chains with the *open* boundary conditions. The first one for the construction of the impurity models is dependent on the main idea that the spectral parameters in the scattering matrix of the model rely on the difference of the particles' rapidities. This method has been firstly used to the impurity model of the 1D quantum lattice gases with the periodic conditions by Eckle, Punnoose and Römer [7], where the integrable condition continues to be satisfied under an arbitrary local shift of the related parameter (See, for example [14]). The second method depends on that the scattering matrix of the bulk of the $t - J$ model relies on the tangent (or cotangent) functions of the half moments of the electrons [15]. The very interesting thing is that the corresponding Hamiltonian with the magnetic impurities has a simple and compact form [16], which is different from the one in the open Hubbard impurity model [17]. The boundary scattering matrix between the impurity and the electron can be factorized as two terms: one is similar as the R matrix and another is similar as the inverse of the R matrix with the inverse spectral parameter, justly as rightly obtained by Zvyagin and Johannesson in their very interesting work [18]. They revealed the existence of a hidden Kondo effect driven by forward electron scattering off the impurity related to this property of the boundary scattering matrix.

As is well known, the bound states can be formed for the strongly correlated electron system and quantum spin chains within the charge or spin sectors and they are very important to decide the thermodynamics of the system and the its low temperature properties. Despite the success of the QISM and BA approach to the investigation of the magnetic impurities in correlated system, it is not very clear that the impurities contribute to the bound states of the strongly correlated system with the *open* boundary conditions. In this letter, we discuss this problem in details.

In general a bound state can be formed by several complex rapidities of the particles, such as charges or spins. The total energy of these complex modes and the total moments of the ones should be real. Under the open boundary conditions, the rapidities u_j of the charges or spins should satisfy also that $u_j \neq \pm u_l$ when $j \neq l$. Otherwise, the wave function is zero, which means that this situation is forbidden. When the complex rapidities form a bound state, the above three conditions should be satisfied for the correlated system under the open boundary conditions. For clarity we here focus on the case of the quantum Heisenberg model. When the two impurities with the arbitrary spins are coupled to this open quantum spin chain, the Hamiltonian of the system can be written as

$$H = \frac{J}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \vec{\sigma}_j \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{j+1} + J_L \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{S}_L + J_R \vec{\sigma}_N \cdot \vec{S}_R, \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{\sigma}_j$ are the Pauli matrices; $\vec{S}_{L,R}$ are the impurity moments with the arbitrary spins $S_{L,R}$. The site number of the bulk is N . $J_{L,R}$ are two arbitrary real constants which describe the coupling between the bulk and the impurities and can be parameterized as

$$J_{L,R} = \frac{J}{(S_{L,R} + \frac{1}{2})^2 - c_{L,R}^2} \quad (2)$$

with the arbitrary constants $c_{L,R}$. This Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by using the standard Bethe ansatz scheme. The eigenvalue of the energy of this impurity system is

$$E(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_M) = \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{-J}{\lambda_j^2 + \frac{1}{4}} + \sum_{l=L,R} J_l S_l + \frac{J(N-1)}{2},$$

with the following Bethe ansatz equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\lambda_j + \frac{i}{2}}{\lambda_j - \frac{i}{2}} \right)^{2N} \prod_{l=L,R} \prod_{r=\pm 1} \frac{\lambda_j + i(S_l + r c_l)}{\lambda_j - i(S_l + r c_l)} \\ &= \prod_{l=1(l \neq j)}^M \prod_{r=\pm 1} \frac{\lambda_j + r \lambda_l + i}{\lambda_j + r \lambda_l - i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Now we study the boundary bound states in detail for the above Heisenberg impurity model. From definition (2) we know that $-c_{L,R}$ is equivalent to $c_{L,R}$ because they give the same Hamiltonian (1). So, without losing generality, we restrict the parameters $c_{L,R}$ to non-negative values in the following discussion.

When the coupling in the bulk is antiferromagnetic ($J > 0$) and the coupling between the bulk and the impurity is ferromagnetic, the system has the following boundary bound states (BBS):

$$\lambda_{3,1} = i(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R}), \quad (4)$$

$$\lambda_{3,2} = -\frac{i}{2}(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R} - 1), \quad (5)$$

$$\lambda_{3,3} = -\frac{i}{2}(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R} + 1), \quad (6)$$

when the parameters $c_{L,R}$ in the regime $S_{L,R} + 1/2 < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1$. These two BBS, one BBS for each ends (L and R) of the chain, are formed by the three imaginary modes of λ , respectively. They carry the energy

$$E_{L,R}^{(3)} = \frac{12J [3(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 2]}{[4(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 1][(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 4]}. \quad (7)$$

The moments of the centers of the BBS are $\sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_{3,j} = 0$. It means that this kind of bound states is localized at the edges of the system. Of course, the energy and the moments of the centers of the BBS are all real and the spin rapidities satisfy that $\lambda_{3,1} \neq \pm \lambda_{3,2} \neq \lambda_{3,3} \neq \pm \lambda_{3,1}$ which ensure that the antisymmetric wave functions of the system are not zero. Therefore, these BBS satisfy all the physical demand. By making the transformations $\lambda_{3,j} \rightarrow -\lambda_{3,j}$

($j = 1, 2, 3$) in the relations (4-6), the BBS with the three imaginary modes can be obtained also for the Heisenberg impurity model with $S_{L,R} + 1/2 < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1$. They carry the energy also as the form (7).

When the coupling in the bulk is antiferromagnetic ($J > 0$) and the coupling between the bulk and the impurity falls also into the antiferromagnetic regime, the above BBS (4-6) with the three imaginary modes are formed under the condition $1/3 + S_{L,R} < c_{L,R} < 1/2 + S_{L,R}$. The corresponding imaginary modes with the transformations $\lambda_{3,j} \rightarrow -\lambda_{3,j}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are also the BBS in this case. The energy expression (7) do not change the forms and the moments of the centers of the bound states are also zero. By taking the logarithm of the Bethe ansatz equation (3) and introducing the distribution functions of the spin rapidities, we can get the integral equations of the impurity model for the ground state. Then we have that the self-magnetization of the ground state is $S_L + S_R - 1$ for the two up impurity spins, or $1 - S_L - S_R$ for the two down impurity spins, or $\pm(S_L - S_R)$ for the one up and one down impurity spins. The similar procedure gives that the self-magnetization of the ground state is also $\pm(S_L - S_R)$ when the coupling in the bulk is antiferromagnetic but the coupling between the bulk and the impurity is ferromagnetic. When the parameters $c_{L,R}$, which describe the coupling between the impurities and the bulk, satisfy that $S_{L,R} < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1/3$, there are the BBS formed by the three imaginary modes as relations (4-6) and the ones by the transformations $\lambda_{3,j} \rightarrow -\lambda_{3,j}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$). They carry the energy (7) and have the zero moments of the centers of the BBS. In this case, the coupling between the bulk and the impurities are in the antiferromagnetic regime if the exchange interaction in the bulk is antiferromagnetic, too. Furthermore, in this case ($S_{L,R} < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1/3$), there are two bound states (one for each ends of the chain) formed by the following five imaginary modes of λ , respectively,

$$\lambda_{5,1} = i(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R}), \quad (8)$$

$$\lambda_{5,2} = i(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R} + 1), \quad (9)$$

$$\lambda_{5,3} = i(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R} - 1), \quad (10)$$

$$\lambda_{5,4} = -\frac{i}{2}(3S_{L,R} - 3c_{L,R} - 1), \quad (11)$$

$$\lambda_{5,5} = -\frac{i}{2}(3S_{L,R} - 3c_{L,R} + 1). \quad (12)$$

They carry the energy

$$E_{L,R}^{(5)} = \frac{20J [7(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 6]}{[9(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 4][4(S_{L,R} - c_{L,R})^2 - 9]}. \quad (13)$$

The moments of the centers of above bound states formed by the five imaginary modes of λ are $\sum_{j=1,2,\dots,5} \lambda_{5,j} = 0$. So they localize at the two edges of the Heisenberg spin chain and $\lambda_{5,j} \neq \pm \lambda_{5,l}$ if $j \neq l$ ($j, l = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) which ensure that the system has a non-zero antisymmetric wave function. Similarly as the case of the BBS of the three imaginary modes, the transformations $\lambda_{5,j} \rightarrow -\lambda_{5,j}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) give also the boundary bound states of the system and they do not change the expression of the energy and the moments of the centers of the bound states are also zero. By the use of the method mentioned above, we get that the self-magnetization of the model is same as the situation $1/3 + S_{L,R} < c_{L,R} < 1/2 + S_{L,R}$. The above BBS satisfy the three conditions of the complex modes.

In the following part, we describe simply the self-magnetization and the BBS of the ferromagnetic Heisenberg impurity model. By solving the Bethe ansatz equations in the thermodynamic limit, we get that the self-magnetization of the system is $S_L + S_R + N/2$ when the coupling between the impurities and the bulk is also ferromagnetic. Otherwise, the self-magnetization is $-S_L - S_R + N/2$ for the antiferromagnetic exchange interaction between the impurities and the bulk. When one impurity has the ferromagnetic interaction with the bulk and another impurity has the antiferromagnetic interaction with the bulk, the self-magnetization of the system has the form $\pm(S_L - S_R) + N/2$. When $S_{L,R} + 1/2 < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1$, the system has the BBS formed by the three imaginary modes (4-6) and the BBS carry the energy (7). By making the transformations $\lambda_{3,j} \rightarrow -\lambda_{3,j}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$), the corresponding bound states are also the BBS of the system. They satisfy all of the three conditions and the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is antiferromagnetic. When the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is ferromagnetic, the system has the BBS which can be formed by the three imaginary modes (4-6) or the five imaginary modes (8-12) with $S_{L,R} < c_{L,R} < S_{L,R} + 1/3$. They carry the energies as expressions (7) and (13), respectively. Of course, the corresponding imaginary modes with the transformations $\lambda_{3,j} = -\lambda_{3,j}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$) and $\lambda_{5,l} = -\lambda_{5,l}$ ($l = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) form also the BBS of the impurity model. When $1/3 + S_L < c_L < S_L + 1/2$, we have the BBS (4-6) or the inverse of rapidities and the exchange interaction between the bulk and the impurities is ferromagnetic. Notice that the system may have the other form of the impurity bound states in the above restricted range of the impurity couplings $J_{L,R}$. It is also an open problem to find out the impurity bound states for other values of the impurity couplings for the strongly correlated system.

The above discussion shows that the ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic Heisenberg spin chains with the magnetic impurities have always the BBS arisen by the impurities when the strengths of the interactions between the bulk and the impurities are proper. These bound states carry the real energy and the moments of the centers of the BBS are zero. They satisfy all of the three conditions of the imaginary modes. For the ferromagnetic Heisenberg model, the system has the BBS formed by the three imaginary modes and the five imaginary modes of the spin rapidities when the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is ferromagnetic. When the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is antiferromagnetic, the system has only the BBS contained the three imaginary modes of the rapidities. For the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model, the system has the BBS formed by the three imaginary modes and the five imaginary modes of the spin rapidities when the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is antiferromagnetic. When the coupling between the bulk and the impurities is ferromagnetic, the system has only the BBS contained the three imaginary modes of the rapidities. And the Kondo screening -as predicted by Furusaki and Nagaosa [2]- exists for the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model with the ferromagnetic coupling between the bulk and the impurities. At zero impurity couplings ($J_{L,R} = 0$), the system has impurity bound states, although trivial, which just correspond to the $2S_{L,R} + 1$ spin states of the impurity. By turning on the boundary coupling, the BBS can be formed by the imaginary modes of the rapidities and the number of the BBS might change. The BBS can affect the ground state of the whole system when the boundary coupling is strong enough, which is under investigation. New properties of the specific heat, excited state, dressed energy, *et al* can be introduced due to the impurity couplings. We point out that the similar BBS with three or five imaginary modes contributed by the magnetic impurities can be found also for the strongly correlated electron systems such as the Hubbard model and the $t - J$ model with the open boundary conditions in the charge sectors. The BBS carry the energy and satisfy the above three conditions of the imaginary modes. Finally, the way the string affects the distribution of the rapidities is also the interesting subject for the further investigation.

To conclude, we have found that the BBS arisen by the magnetic impurities in a correlated host under the open boundary conditions. These BBS are formed by three or five imaginary modes such as charges or spins. The imaginary modes of the bound states due to the magnetic impurities satisfy that: (i) the total energy is real; (ii) the total moment of the imaginary modes is real (zero); (iii) the absolute values of the imaginary modes are different. These BBS carry the energy and pin at the edges of the system. And the Kondo screening exists for the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model with the ferromagnetic coupling between the bulk and the impurities.

-
- [1] Tomonaga S 1950 Prog. Theor. Phys. **5** 544; Luttinger J M 1963 J. Math. Phys. **4** 1154; Haldane F D M 1980 Phys. Rev. Lett. **45** 1358; 1981 J. Phys. C **14** 2582
 - [2] Furusaki A and Nagaosa N 1994 Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** 892
 - [3] Lee D -H and Toner J 1992 Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** 3378; Wang Y and Voit J 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 4934
 - [4] Kondo J 1964 Prog. Theor. Phys. **32** 37
 - [5] Tsvetlick A M and Wiegmann P B 1983 Adv. Phys. **32** 453; Andrei N Furuya K and Lowenstein J H 1983 Rev. Mod. Phys. **55** 331
 - [6] Andrei N and Johnsson H 1984 Phys. Lett. A **100** 108
 - [7] Eckle H -P, Punnoose A and Römer R A 1997 Europhys. Lett. **39** 293
 - [8] Schlottmann P and Zvyagin A A 1997 Phys. Rev. B **55** 5027; Zvyagin A A and Schlottmann P 1997 J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **9** 3543; Links J and Foerster A 1999 J. Phys. A **32** 147
 - [9] Zvyagin A A 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** 4641
 - [10] Kane C L and Fisher M P A 1992 Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** 1220; 1992 Phys. Rev. B **46** 15233
 - [11] Affleck I 1990 Nucl. Phys. B **336** 517; Ludwig A W W and Affleck I 1994 Nucl. Phys. B **428** 545
 - [12] Gaudin M 1971 Phys. Rev. A **4** 386; Schultz H 1985 J. Phys. C **18** 581; Sklyanin E K 1988 J. Phys. A **21** 2375
 - [13] Fendley P 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 2485; Fendley P, Ludwig A W W and Saleur H 1995 Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** 3005
 - [14] Hu Z N and Pu F C 1998 Phys. Rev. B **58** R2925; Hu Z N 1998 Phys. Lett. A **250** 337; Wang Y 1997 Phys. Rev. B **56** 14045
 - [15] Schlottmann P 1997 Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **11** 355
 - [16] Hu Z N, Pu F C and Wang Y 1998 J. Phys. A **31** 5241; Wang Y Dai J, Hu Z N and Pu F C 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** 1901; Hu Z N and Pu F C 1999 Nucl. Phys. B **546** 691
 - [17] Hu Z N and Pu F C 1999 Europhys. Lett. **45** 514
 - [18] Zvyagin A A and Johannesson H 1998 Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** 2751